UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,409	08/10/2001	David Hitz	103.1019.10	7457

22883   7590   07/19/2004

SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC
P.O. BOX 390013
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013

EXAMINER
HAMILTON, MONPLAISIR G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/927,409	HITZ ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	Monplaisir G Hamilton	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 April 2004.*

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *31-50 and 54-58* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) *1-30* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *31-50 and 54-58* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The communication filed on 4/19/04 amended Claims 31, 34, 35 and 39-13, cancelled

Claims 51-53 and added Claims 57-58. Claims 31-50 and 54-58 remain for examination.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 31 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the
subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 35, 38 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 35 and 38 recites the limitation "the steps of". There is insufficient antecedent

basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 57 recites the limitation "as in Claim 1". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Appropriate correction is required. Examiner has referenced Claim 31 to correspond to Claim 1.

Terminal Disclaimer

4.   The terminal disclaimer filed on 3/5/04 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of US 6,457,130 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 31-50 and 54-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Teper et al (US 5,815,665).

Referring to Claim 31:

Teper discloses a method of operating a file server, said method including steps of:

identifying a file on said file server with a first security style selected from among a

plurality of security styles corresponding to a plurality of operating systems implemented on said

file server (col 18, lines 1-15); and

enforcing said first security style for all accesses to said file (col 14, lines 5-10; col 16,

lines 5-15; col 18, lines 5-10) including accesses in another one of said plurality of security

styles (col 14, lines 10-20).

Referring to Claim 32:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 31 above. Teper further discloses wherein said

plurality of security styles includes a Windows NT security style (col 14, lines 5-10).

Referring to Claim 33:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 31 above. Teper further discloses wherein said

plurality of security styles includes a Unix security style (col 14, lines 15-20).

Referring to Claim 34:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 31 above. Teper further discloses said enforcing

step enforces said security style for all accesses to the first file regardless of the security style

associated with the entity who seeks access to the file (col 13, lines 1-10; col 18, lines 40-50).

Referring to Claim 35:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 31 above. Teper further discloses associating said

file with a subset of files in a file system (col 15, lines 35-55); and limiting said subset of files to a

security subset of said plurality of security style (col 15, lines 45-50); wherein attempts to set

permission in said subset of files are restricted to said security subset (col 16, lines 1-15).

Referring to Claim 36:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 35 above. Teper further discloses said security

subset includes a Windows NT security style (col 14, lines 5-10).

Referring to Claim 37:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 35 above. Teper further discloses said security

subset includes a Unix security style (col 14, lines 15-20).

Referring to Claim 38:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 35 above. Teper further discloses the step of

caching associations and limits for the subset of files for future use (col 16, lines 20-50).

Referring to Claim 39:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 31 above. Teper further discloses wherein the

steps of identifying and enforcing further comprise mapping permissions in said first security

style to a second security style, and wherein said mapping can be performed dynamically or

statically (col 14, lines 1-15).

Referring to Claim 40:

Teper discloses a method of operating a file server, said method including steps of:

identifying a file on said file server with a first security style selected from among a

plurality of security styles corresponding to a plurality of operating systems implemented on said

file server (col 18, lines 1-15);

enforcing said first security style for all accesses to said file server including accesses in

another one of said plurality of security styles (col 14, lines 5-10; col 16, lines 5-15; col

18, lines 5-10); and

identifying said file with a second security style selected from among the plurality of

security styles in response to a file server request (col 14, lines 5-20).

Referring to Claim 41:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 40 above. Teper further discloses including

steps of associating said second security style with a file server request for setting permissions

for said file when said file server request is successful (col 15, line 55-col 16, line 20).

Referring to Claim 42:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 40 above. Teper further discloses said file is

associated with said second security style regardless of the security style previously associated

with said file (col 14, lines 5-15; col 16, lines 5-20;).

Referring to Claim 43:

Teper discloses a file server including:

a set of files available on said file server, each said file having an associated security style

selected from among a plurality of security styles corresponding to a plurality of operating

systems implemented on said file server (col 15, lines 35-55);

wherein said file server enforces said associated security style for all accesses to said file

including accesses in another one of said plurality of security styles (col 14, lines 5-10; col 16,

lines 5-15; col 18, lines 5-10).

Referring to Claim 44:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 43 above. Teper further discloses said plurality

of security styles includes a Windows NT security style (col 14, lines 5-10).

Referring to Claim 45:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 43 above. Teper further discloses said plurality

of security styles includes a Unix security style (col 14, lines 15-20)..

Referring to Claim 46:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 43 above. Teper further discloses including a

subtree of files [service area] in said file system associated with a security subset of said plurality

of security styles (col 15, lines 40-55); wherein said file server restricts attempts to set

permissions in said subtree to said security subset (col 16, line 1-20).

Referring to Claim 47:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 46 above. Teper further discloses said security

subset includes a Windows NT security style (col 14, lines 5-15).

Referring to Claim 48:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 46 above. Teper further discloses said security

subset includes a Unix security style (col 14, lines 10-20).

Referring to Claim 49:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 43 above. Teper further discloses said file server

is capable of altering the security style associated with said file in response to a file server

request (col 14, lines 5-20).

Referring to Claim 50:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 49 above. Teper further discloses said file server

is capable of altering the security style associated with said file in response to a file server

request when said file server request is successful (col 15, lines 20-65).

Referring to Claim 54:

Teper discloses

a file server having a plurality of files and a security style associated with each file, said

security style being selected from among a plurality of security styles corresponding to a

plurality of operating systems implemented on said file server (col 14, lines 1-20; col 15, lines

40-55),

a data structure associating a security subset of said plurality of security styles with a

subtree of said files available on said file server (col 15, lines 35-60).

Referring to Claim 55:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 54 above. Teper further discloses said security

subset includes a Windows NT security style (col 14, lines 1-10).

Referring to Claim 56:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 54 above. Teper further discloses said security

subset includes a Unix security style (col 14, lines 10-20).

Referring to Claim 57:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 31 above. Teper further discloses said step of

enforcing further comprises translating a user identification associated with said accesses to said

first security style or translating access control limits for said file to a second security style

associated with said accesses (col 15, lines 30-col 16, line 20).

Referring to Claim 58:

Teper discloses the limitations of Claim 43 above. Teper further discloses said file server

enforces said associated security style by translating a user identification associated with said

accesses to said associated security style (col 15, lines 30-60) or by translating access control

limits for said file to a second security style associated with said accesses (col 16, lines 5-20).

Prior Art

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

US 4747040 issued to Blanset, David R. et al. Blanset discloses the UNIX.RTM. and MS-

DOS.RTM. operating systems are supported in a multi-tasking computer. At the heart of the

computer is a microprocessor having protected and non-protected modes. The computer

includes special-purpose hardware which prevents the MS-DOS system and its applications,

which execute in the non-protected mode, from interfering with the UNIX system and its

applications, which execute in the protected mode. In particular, this hardware monitors

addresses generated by the computer and, by selectively inhibiting the associated control pulses,

prevents the MS-DOS system from, for example, writing in UNIX-system-allocated memory, or

accessing I/O devices that the UNIX system is currently using. In addition, a context switching

feature is provided whereby the user can select, via a keyboard operation, to have displayed on

the computer video monitor at any given time the image generated from the current UNIX

system screen data or the image generated from the current MS-DOS system screen data.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Monplaisir G Hamilton whose telephone number is (703) 305-5116. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y Vu can be reached on (703) 305-4393. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Monplaisir Hamilton

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAM
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 21_